

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. Claims 2, 4, 7, 8, 10, and 30-32 are pending in the present application, with claims 30-32 being independent.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 4, 7, 8, 10, and 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Flowers Jr. et al.* (US 5,533,174) in view of *Shimizu* (US 6,189,020). This rejection is respectfully traversed insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims.

Independent claim 30 is directed to a font sharing system in which data can be communicated between a client computer and a server. Data representing a character string including a plurality of characters and data representing sizes of characters are included in the character string being transmitted to the server from the client computer. The server includes layout generating means for generating data representing a layout based upon the data representing the character string and the data representing the sizes of characters transmitted from said client computer, and transmitting means for transmitting the layout data generated by

said layout generating means. The client computer includes display control means for controlling a display device so as to display only layout frames in a preview area on a display screen. Each of the layout frames corresponding to the size of each character included in the character string based upon the layout data transmitted from said transmitting means of said server. Each of the layout frames being box-shaped such that each of the layout frames is able to enclose their respective characters that are represented by the data representing the sizes of characters.

Flowers Jr. is directed to a font server that communicates and provides workstations and printers with font specific information that allows them to select a licensed font and allows them to specify how to customize the font. *Shimizu* is directed to a document processing apparatus for inputting, type-setting, and displaying document information.

The Examiner acknowledges on page 4 of the outstanding Office Action that *Flowers Jr.* does not teach that each of the layout frames are box-shaped such that each of the layout frames is able to enclose their respective characters that are represented by the data representing the sizes of characters. The Examiner, however, cites *Shimizu* for support thereof. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that Fig. 6 and col. 11, lines 10-12, col. 12, lines 30-41,

and the abstract of *Shimizu* teaches the above recited deficiencies of *Flowers Jr.*

Applicants respectfully submit that neither *Flowers Jr.* nor *Shimizu* teach or suggest that only layout frames are displayed in a preview area of a display screen, wherein the layout data represents layout frames that are box-shaped such that each of the frames is able to enclose their respective characters that are represented by the data representing the sizes of characters, as recited in the amended independent claims. In fact, *Flowers Jr.* and *Shimizu* contain absolutely no teaching that only layout frames are displayed in a preview area of a display screen.

Referring to Fig. 8 and page 20, lines 14-17, of the present application, it can be readily seen that only layout frames (which enclose their respective characters) are displayed in the preview area A17 of the display screen.

Dependent claims 2, 4, 7, 8, and 10 should be considered allowable at least for depending from an allowable base claim.

Accordingly, in view of the above discussion, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, this application appears to be in condition for allowance and the Examiner is, therefore, requested to reexamine the application and pass the claims to issue.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Martin Geissler (Reg. No. 51,011) at the telephone number below, which is located in the Washington, DC area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 

D. Richard Anderson, Reg.#40,439

DRA/MEG:tm
0905-0216P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000